

1 BRUCE E. H. JOHNSON (State Bar No. 159927)
brucejohnson@dwt.com

2 **DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP**

1201 3rd Avenue, Suite 2200

3 Seattle, Washington 98101

Telephone: (206) 622-3150

4 Facsimile: (206) 757-7700

5 THOMAS R. BURKE (State Bar No. 141930)

thomasburke@dwt.com

6 NICOLAS A. JAMPOL (State Bar No. 244867)

nicolasjampol@dwt.com

7 **DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP**

505 Montgomery Street, Suite 800

8 San Francisco, California 94111

Telephone: (415) 276-6500

9 Facsimile: (415) 276-6599

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
13

14 NATIONWIDE BIWEEKLY
ADMINISTRATION, INC., an Ohio
15 corporation; LOAN PAYMENT
ADMINISTRATION LLC, an Ohio limited
16 liability company; and DANIEL S. LIPSKY, an
17 individual;

18 Plaintiffs,

19 vs.

20 JOHN F. HUBANKS, Deputy District Attorney,
Monterey County District Attorney's Office, in
21 his official capacity; ANDRES H. PEREZ,
Deputy District Attorney, Marin County District
22 Attorney's Office, in his official capacity;
23 MONTEREY COUNTY DISTRICT
ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, a County agency; and
24 MARIN COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S
OFFICE, a County agency,

25 Defendants.
26

) Case No. 14-cv-04420-LHK

) **PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE**
) **MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER**
) **CASES SHOULD BE RELATED**

1 Pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-12, Plaintiffs hereby move the Court to determine whether this case
2 should be related to another case filed in this district, captioned *Nationwide Biweekly*
3 *Administration, Inc. v. Jan Lynn Owen, in her official capacity as Commissioner of the Department*
4 *of Business Oversight for the State of California*, Case No. 14-cv-05166-EJD (the “Licensing
5 Case.”).¹ Civil L.R. 3-12 provides that cases are related when: (1) they “concern substantially the
6 same parties, property, transaction or event” and (2) “[i]t appears likely that there will be an unduly
7 burdensome duplication of labor and expenses or conflicting results if the cases are conducted
8 before different Judges.” Civil L.R. 3-12(a). Plaintiffs respectfully submit that both requirements
9 are met as to this case and the Licensing Case.

10 As to the first requirement, both cases concern the same parties and the same transactions
11 and events: they arise out of the joint, threatened prosecution by the same “prosecution team”
12 against the same party – Nationwide Biweekly Administration, Inc. (“Nationwide”) – for the same
13 purported conduct.

14 Specifically, in this case, defendants John F. Hubanks, Andres H. Perez, the Monterey
15 County District Attorney’s Office and the Marin County District Attorney’s Office (collectively,
16 the “District Attorney Defendants”) threatened to prosecute Plaintiffs for advertising and
17 conducting business in California, claiming that Nationwide violated Bus. & Prof. Code § 14700 *et*
18 *seq.*, California’s unfair competition law (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200), California’s unfair
19 advertising law (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500), and Cal. Fin. Code § 12000, *et. seq.* (the “Prorater
20 Law”) for “acting as a prorater” without a license. (Dkt. 6-5 [July 30, 2013 Letter].) As to the
21 contention that Nationwide had violated the Prorater Law, the District Attorney Defendants referred
22 the issue for prosecution to the Enforcement Division of the Department of Business Oversight
23 (“DBO”), which is under the Supervision of Commissioner Jan Lynn Owen. As stated by the
24 District Attorney Defendants, they, together with the DBO, formed a “prosecution team” that
25 would “be a party to the judgment, stipulated or litigated” against Plaintiffs. (Ex. 2, May 22, 2014
26 Email.) Further, District Attorney Defendants, DBO, and Nationwide were all parties to two tolling
27

28 ¹ The Complaint filed in the Licensing Case is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

1 agreements arising out of this threatened, joint prosecution, and the same parties participated in an
2 all-day meeting at the Monterey County District Attorney's Office on August 26, 2014 concerning
3 the same. (Ex. 3, Lipsky Decl. ISO Mot. for Prelim. Inj., ¶¶ 19-20.)

4 In both this case and the Licensing Case, Nationwide contends that it may properly conduct
5 its business in California and the threatened prosecution by the so-called "prosecution team" – i.e.,
6 the Deputy District Attorneys and the DBO – is unconstitutional. Stated simply, both cases arise
7 out of the same transactions, same events, and same threatened prosecution by the same
8 prosecution team against the same party – Nationwide. Civil L.R. 3-12(a)(1) is accordingly
9 satisfied.

10 As to the second requirement, the litigation of both cases in this Court will reduce
11 duplication of labor and expense by requiring only a single court to familiarize itself with the facts
12 and witnesses in both cases. Nationwide's business model and operations in California are central
13 to both cases. (*Compare* Dkt. 1, ¶¶ 12-14 with Ex. 1, Complaint, ¶¶ 8-15.) Further, both cases
14 involve the threatened joint prosecution of Nationwide based on its business model and operations
15 and important constitutional questions concerning governmental overreaching in violation of
16 constitutional protections. (*Compare* Dkt. 1, ¶¶ 18-22 with Ex. 1, Complaint, ¶¶ 19-31.) Moreover,
17 to the extent that any ADR efforts are attempted through the court, all parties would be available
18 before this Court, which could be more productive given that the defendants in both cases view
19 themselves as members of the same "prosecution team." Last, finding these cases related would
20 prevent the possibility of any conflicting results. Although no motion to dismiss is pending in
21 either case, and no defendant has yet to file an answer, there is some likelihood that the defendants
22 (who are all government defendants) will raise some of the same defenses to the claims brought by
23 Nationwide under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Therefore, Civil L.R. 3-12(a)(2) is also satisfied.

24 Lastly, pursuant to L.R. 7-11(a), concurrently filed with this administrative motion is a
25 stipulation in which all parties to this lawsuit have agreed that this case and the Licensing Case
26 should be deemed related.

27 * * *

1 For the reasons stated herein, Plaintiffs respectfully submit that the requirements of Civil
2 L.R. 3-12 are met, and that this Court should find that this case is related to the Licensing Case.
3

4 Dated: December 8, 2014

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
BRUCE E. H. JOHNSON
THOMAS R. BURKE
NICOLAS A. JAMPOL

7 By: /s/ Bruce E. H. Johnson
Bruce E. H. Johnson

8
9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

Anne Michelle Burr
Attorney General
Business & Tax Section
Office of the Attorney General
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, California 94102
annemichell.burr@doj.ca.gov